Case: 115-cv-00071-WAL-EAH Document #: 356-1 Filed: 11/20/23 Page 1 of 5

2.3

the value of the -- the value of the confidential information. Maybe there was a narrower interpretation of that than the Court had intended because the Court was taking this sort of -- as part of the context in which the Court had been dealing. Maybe that's where the -- the disconnect has come. But that's why the Court was having problems with it and that's why the Court was going over it and going over it and thinking there's something -- there is a disconnect here someplace and that's what the Court has come up with.

MR. SIMPSON: And -- and given that, Your Honor, A.B.R. does withdraw from the stipulation.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, having had that and since one party has indicated they're withdrawing, there is no stipulation. So I guess we'll go forward from there. Now, this raises the precise issue that the parties had assumed was included in the Court's order. Maybe it's -- it's worth looking at that issue, which as I said, I'm not opining on because I need to have the positions of the parties on it. Obviously, the defense seems like you would be arguing, look, even if they're able to establish -- you know, here's what you have to

Associated Reporters Int'l., Inc. 518-465-8029

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

establish, you establish the damages, that flow. This is what the law says.

And if they're able to -- even if they're able to establish that they think it flows from it, they're not entitled to it because it resembles this -- the types of damages that you would get if you pursued a claim that you have already said is barred. I presume that -- that might be, I don't know, that might be the defense's position. could be that, you know, well, maybe these things that Atty. Simpson is claiming on behalf of the plaintiff really flows from a violation or an alleged violation of the N.D.A. They don't really flow from The Court shouldn't be taking into consideration it. these things, these types of damages because they don't properly flow from a violation even if you were to fi -- even if the -- the -- the jury were to find that there is a violation of the N.D.A.

These types of damages clearly can be said to flow from it. That might be another position, a different position than simply because it resembles something that the Plaintiffs might have been entitled to had you not barred their claims.

They can't get it. This other thing would be a different position. Those don't flow from -- though

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

you can't say that they flow from any violation of the N.D.A. That's another position. Maybe it's worthwhile to -- to have that issue adjudicated in advance so that it's clear at least whatever the -- the Court finds is proper or not.

I mean, you are in a better position having, you know -- you, Atty. Simpson, you have your expert, Mr. Howse, who has looked at this. You've seen the expert report so you know the types of damages they're claiming. You all are in the best position to know. Well are we saying, defense, that this is clearly outside the ballpark? Because it seems to me that before there is a trial that there should be clarity as to the types of damages that the -- that the Plaintiff might be seeking if the Plaintiff were to prevail. Can they get this or not, this type of damage or not, given whatever the factual context is that we're dealing with? But I think that's an issue that remains unresolved and you all can decide how you might want to proceed with regetting -- with regard to getting some clarity, with regard to how -- how that might play out.

MR. SIMPSON: Very well. Okay.

MS. BLITZER: Thank you, Your Honor.

You know, as to your ideas about what Defendants'

Associated Reporters Int'l., Inc. 518-465-8029

2.3

counsel might raise, yes, I -- I think that those are all points that we would raise along with others and would appreciate the opportunity to T this issue up for you.

THE COURT: Okay. And that's -- and that's fine. Like I said, you all can decide exactly how you'd like to proceed. But I do think it might be helpful since this has now come up as sort of an issue. Well, we'll get there anyway. We'll get those damages anyway because we think they're linked to a claim that the Court has said is permissible and we get those -- the same -- basically the same damages. That seems to me an issue that it would be worthwhile to -- to -- it might be worthwhile to address in advance, okay?

So I will -- I will leave sort of how you go forward in your capable hands. I would request, Atty. Simpson, that you put something on the record with regard to withdrawing the stipulation.

And then I will be guided in terms of going forward by how the parties choose to proceed.

MR. SIMPSON: Very well. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Anything further from the defense?

Associated Reporters Int'l., Inc. 518-465-8029